

CONTROL OF THE ARTS IN THE
COMMUNIST EMPIRE

CONSULTATION WITH

IVAN P. BAHRIANY

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

FOR RELEASE

JUL 27 1959

PLEASE GUARD AGAINST
PREMATURE RELEASE



JUNE 3, 1959
(INCLUDING INDEX)

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1959

42006

61-7582-18

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

WILLIAM M. TUCK, Virginia

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

WILLIAM E. MILLER, New York

AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Michigan

RICHARD ARENS, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Synopsis-----	Page 1
June 3, 1959: Consultation with Ivan P. Bahriany-----	3
Index-----	i

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS.

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

18. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * *

RULE XII

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

Sec. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 86TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 7, January 7, 1959

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress.

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

18. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * *

26. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

SYNOPSIS

The so-called cultural exhibits and exchanges of the Soviet Union in the free countries are designed to cover up the brutal realities (including the destruction of culture) which exist behind the Iron Curtain; Ivan P. Bahriany, Ukrainian writer and artist, who escaped from the regime and is currently president of a coalition of all Ukrainian democratic parties in exile, testified in the accompanying consultation with the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Bahriany stated:

I think that the so-called cultural exchanges and exhibits have many dangerous features which Western nations, including the United States, do not realize.

One of the most important purposes of these exchanges is to demoralize the Western countries, including the United States of America. It would be interesting for many Americans to know that these Soviet exchanges and exhibits portray, here in America and in many other countries, things which do not exist in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet authorities endeavor to convince the world that they have such attainments in the arts, in ballet, in music, and in other branches of culture because there exists cultural freedom in the U.S.S.R.

In reality there is none such because there is no cultural freedom at all.

Therefore, by showing these cultural attainments, the so-called attainments, they try to hide what they do not have. They do not have freedom of literature. They have no freedom of artistic creativeness, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom of thought.

They also hide the absence of literary freedom. There are no free writers who can write what they want. Actually they conceal with these exhibits here the so-called "Socialist realism," and the dictatorship of the Communist Party.

Furthermore, this cultural exchange covers up the actual suppression of the national cultures of many peoples in the Soviet Union. Why at this time, when they show attainments of the Soviet state in the literary and artistic fields, at this very moment, are they suppressing the culture of the Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians—and Byelorussians—and the Baltic peoples, who have no freedom to develop their own culture.

They hide the Russification program which is even more dangerous for the free world, inasmuch as Moscow is perpetrating a vast spiritual genocide against the many peoples it controls.

Mr. Bahriany recounted the imprisonments and persecutions to which he was subjected as a Ukrainian writer and artist and the mass liquidations and terror inflicted on artists and writers whose works are considered disloyal to the Communist regime. Continuing, he stated:

The Soviet Government considers that art should not be left for art's sake. Every art should be subordinate to political objectives. Therefore, they are very much against modern paintings and they are against modern musicians. Many composers suffered persecution because their music was not in conformity with the objectives of the party.

If an artist or painter writes or paints or composes music individually and not according to the party, he is considered a dangerous enemy of the party.

Commenting on the American National Exhibition in Moscow in July of this year, at which will be displayed the works of a number of artists with extensive records of affiliation with the Communist movement in the United States, Mr. Bahriany stated:

The Soviet Government will certainly exploit to the fullest extent the very fact that the United States Government is sending exhibits by pro-Communist artists. They will say: "You see, even the greatest capitalist country, America, has no one but Communist artists."

This I think is not only greatly detrimental to American prestige, but also criminal because after the Hungarian uprising, after the upheavals in Poland and after Tibet, now what we see is the United States trying to support the prestige, the false prestige, of the Communist system in the U.S.S.R.

When we send exhibits of social satire or cartoons, this damages American prestige very strongly in the Soviet Union.

The Communist officials and elite writers will say, "Well, you might not believe us when we say everything is better in the U.S.S.R. than in America, but now you have American artists who satirize the American way of life."

To have the freedom of criticizing American art and science here in America is perfectly all right; but for the United States Government to criticize American life through American artists in the Soviet Union is a crime. The Russians will interpret that entirely differently than we would interpret it.

CONTROL OF THE ARTS IN THE COMMUNIST EMPIRE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1959

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D.C.

CONSULTATION

The following consultation with Ivan P. Bahriany, speaking through Walter Dushnyck as his interpreter, was held at 2 p.m. in room 225, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Committee member present: Representative Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, (chairman).

Also present: Richard Arens, staff director, and Francis J. McNamara, research analyst.

The CHAIRMAN. In pursuance of its practice of eliciting information from authoritative sources on the many operations of the world Communist conspiracy, the Committee on Un-American Activities is pleased to welcome in this consultation today Ivan P. Bahriany, whose background, experience, and sources of information equip him to speak to us as an authority on the subject matter which we shall explore.

Do you, Ivan Bahriany, solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I do.

HCUA 6/3/59

STATEMENT OF IVAN P. BAHRIANY - Testimony (WALTER DUSHNYCK, INTERPRETER)

Mr. ARENS. At the outset of our consultation would you kindly give us your full name and a word about your personal background?

Mr. BAHRIANY. My full name is Ivan Bahriany, Ivan P. Bahriany. My father was a mason. My mother was a peasant woman. My grandfather was a very rich man, what the Soviets now call a "kukul", a rich farmer.

Mr. ARENS. Where and when were you born?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I was born on September 19, 1907, in the village of Kuzmin in the Poltava Province, Ukraine, USSR.

I want also to add that although my mother's father was a rich man, my father's father was a poor worker, and so actually I am of proletarian origin.

That would be significant inasmuch as I was persecuted as a bourgeois later on.

Mr. ARENS. Now may we have a word please about your education.

D.C.

Gek

Austrian
Yugo.

Mr. BAHRIANY. I finished a 3-year church school and, later on, intermediate school in the city of Akhtyrka, near Kharkov, Ukraine.

Later on I was graduated from an art and ceramic school. It was a 2-year school in Krasnopolye, Ukraine.

Then I attended the Kiev Art Institute. (Kiev is the capital of Ukraine.) The school was on the level of an academy of arts. I am a painter as well as a writer.

I finished the course at the art institute. I was not given a diploma because my mother's father was considered to be an "enemy" of the Soviet state. He was "socially and politically unreliable."

Mr. McNAMARA. What year was this that you finished the course in the institute?

Mr. BAHRIANY. It was in 1929.

Subsequently, I went to work in literature, I mean writing for literary magazines. While I was attending the art institute, I was also working as a writer.

Mr. ARENS. We expect to explore with you in this consultation a number of items, including a little bit more of your own background and experience, but for the moment may I inquire what brings you to the United States?

Mr. BAHRIANY. At first I came here in December 1958, to take part in the Congress of Free Ukrainian Writers which met in New York as a counterforce to the similar Congress of Ukrainian Soviet Writers in Kiev.

The second purpose was that, as president of the Ukrainian National Rada, I came here to visit many Ukrainian-American communities to lecture on the danger of communism.

Mr. ARENS. Would you give us just a word now, please, about the Ukrainian National Rada?

Mr. BAHRIANY. The Ukrainian National Rada is a political center and a coalition of all the Ukrainian democratic parties in exile.

It was organized on the basis of the legal Ukrainian National Government, or the Ukrainian National Republic, which was established in Ukraine in 1917 and 1920.

This government was expelled by the Bolsheviks in 1920 and the Rada is a continuation of the same government which was constituted in 1917 in Ukraine.

Mr. ARENS. Where is its headquarters?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I might add that the Rada itself is a sort of parliament-in-exile, while it also has an executive group which functions as the government.

The headquarters of the Rada is permanently located in Munich, Germany.

Mr. ARENS. Is that where your residence is?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I live in Ulm, Germany.

Mr. ARENS. Now with that word of your background, would you kindly tell us about the highlights of your literary career?

Mr. BAHRIANY. In the 1920's when I began my literary activities, writers in the Soviet Union were roughly divided into two categories: proletarian writers who followed the party line and non-proletarian writers who were in opposition, more or less opposing the official line of the Communist Party in the 1920's.

I might add that the determination of a proletarian is not based on the proletarian origin of parents, but on the ideological belief in the

Communist Party. All proletarian writers supported wholeheartedly, one hundred percent, the ideology and policy of the Communist Party.

The non-proletarian writers usually had a critical attitude with regard to the Communist line and those who followed it.

The group of Soviet Ukrainian writers to which I belonged was non-proletarian; it was a group which was not espousing the official Communist line.

I belonged to a group of Soviet Ukrainian writers known as MARS, which means "Workshop of the Revolutionary Word."

This organization was officially labeled by the Soviet Government as an "organization of bourgeois nationalists."

There were charges by the Soviet Government that this organization was spreading and propagating bourgeois ideology opposing the Communist ideology.

My literary work, I mean my novels, my short stories and stories for children, were printed in all Soviet magazines.

Mr. ARENS. May I inquire at this point, if you please, as to the types of work and the extensiveness of your literary productions?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I am both a novelist and a poet, so I published many novels and also poetry in many Soviet Ukrainian magazines. But very soon I was attacked as a "bourgeois nationalist," as one unreliable and dangerous to the Soviet system.

As an example, I would like to cite my book which I published in Kiev, and which was entitled, *To the Forbidden Frontiers*, for which I was labeled a dangerous bourgeois nationalist.

I possess an official Soviet Ukrainian magazine in which I was so labeled and denounced as a menace to the Soviet state. This is an official Marxist literary review of criticism in Ukraine. This, incidentally, I obtained from the New York Public Library and made a photostatic copy. It is the issue for October 1931.

This was an official organ of the Communist Party of Ukraine. Whoever was praised in that journal could advance to a higher degree in the Soviet literary world; and whoever was criticized was marked for destruction.

In an article entitled, "On the *Kurkul* Path—About the Creativeness of Bahriany," which was written by Ol. Pravdiuk and which appeared in the October 1931 issue of *Krytyka* of Kharkov, the Communists had this to say about me:

The title of his collection, *To the Forbidden Frontiers*, itself makes one think that in the thoughts and moods of the writer there is much which he cannot express openly and which lies behind more liberal possibilities and thus is "forbidden." But even that which Bahriany did say is quite eloquent. The general tone of the collection must be regarded as decadent, but at the same time actively inimical to our reality. The writer is dissatisfied with the reality, it is repulsive to him; therefore, he derides it or seeks ways to change it, or at least he tries to escape into the romanticism of the past. * * *

The Socialist attack brings death to the *kurkul*. Therefore, he moans and bites back. The *kurkul* is maddened and becomes ruthless, and, on occasions, forgetting his prudence, he openly and with a gun in his hand stands to defend himself. Despair is pushing the *kurkul* to overt actions. Such is by its character the action of Bahriany in his *Ave Maria*. * * *

The poet resolutely decided to attack the Soviet society. His protest against Soviet reality and especially against Soviet literature is expressed in the following words:

"Don't call me a poet, because the term 'poet,' in short, nowadays means: chameleon, prostitute, speculator, and adventurer, and a lazy good-for-nothing. I want to be a human being of whom there are but a few in the world."

Having taken himself out of the family of Soviet writers, Bahriany further declares:

"Today I am beginning my campaign on a new path, paved with stones. I have finally decided to do it as a result of objective and subjective reasons, and if I break my neck, I will not feel sorry. The wet one is not afraid of water * * *"

As we see, the early works of Bahriany prove that in essence he is an ideologist of the rich *kurkul* groups of the village, which harbor enmity against the policies of the party and Soviet authority in the village. Hence the negative attitude of the writer toward the Soviet reality, the proletariat and toward the process of reconstruction. * * *

In his manifestation in *Ave Maria*, Bahriany has proved that not only he cannot reconcile himself with the Soviet reality, but that he has the intention to fight against it and to change it. The same tendency is clearly reflected in *Skelka*. As a source material the writer took a legend about the uprising of slaves against the Skelka monastery. He is seeking in the past "sympathetic" moods, by attempting to find situations similar to ones which the writer is observing today, and by trying to express his present desires in the material and in the background of historical events. * * *

Standing on the bourgeois national position in the evaluation of political events of that time, Bahriany borrows from the bourgeois historical literature its trite triangle as a subject. All his work is the struggle of the triangle and not of the masses. The masses are colorless and only moan and, excited to the fullest, follow their leaders. They are not even background for the development of action. The writer is attracted by "strong character," capable of protesting and struggling and ready for everything but he is not attracted by the masses. Such strong individuals, who can captivate the masses, are Danylo and Harmash, two peasant chieftains. * * *

Bahriany is the least interested in reflecting class struggle in the condition of feudal society and in showing all its peculiarity and complexity. For him the most important is the struggle against "foreigners"; he needs to glorify rebellions in order to justify his own concept of *kurkul* vendetta. * * *

The process of socialist construction evokes the sharpening of the class struggle. The remnants of the capitalist class are suffering defeat after defeat, but this does not in the least prevent them from taking advantage of any possibility for a hostile action. Very often the *kurkuls* through their ideologists had tried to take advantage of the artistic, especially the literary, front. Thus this action merits increased attention and proletarian alertness, especially in the sector of literary criticism, where *kurkul* ideologists, through methods of mimicry, are attempting to beguile the proletarian criticism. The creativeness of Bahriany is a manifestation of such mimic activity.

Skelka of Bahriany attests that he has not made a return and has not left the old positions, which are hostile to the proletariat. From the very beginning the writer became a glorifier of *kurkul* ideology and has remained such to this very day.

Also at that time I published a historical novel based on the historical aspirations of the Ukrainian people fighting against foreign invaders.

The Soviet official critics attacked me, saying that although my theme was historical, actually what I treated was the present Soviet regime, which I attacked.

Mr. ARENS. Now would you kindly tell us whether you have suffered any physical persecutions as a result of your writings?

Mr. BAHRIANY. In this magazine, I was denounced as a bourgeois nationalist and as one dangerous to Marxism, and subsequently, yes, I was arrested.

Mr. ARENS. What happened then?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I was arrested in 1932 by the GPU and I was kept in a solitary cell for 11 months. I was accused under Articles 10 and 11 of the Soviet Penal Code as being a "counterrevolutionary," an "enemy" of the Soviet regime.

I was accused of fomenting anti-Soviet agitation, of organizing uprisings against the Soviet regime and also of organizing membership in an illegal anti-Soviet organization.

Mr. ARENS. Then what happened?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Then I had a secret trial at which I was condemned to 5 years at hard labor in Siberia; I was given the minimum term that the law prescribed because I was young at that time.

In Siberia I was placed in the Bama-lag system. This is a system of slave labor camps on the Baikal-Amur railroad line.

Mr. ARENS. Give us a word, please, about your experiences in the slave labor camp or camps.

Mr. BAHRIANY. I worked as a common laborer, cutting lumber and also building railroad tracks. Conditions were extremely hard. The ground was frozen, sometimes 4 to 5 feet. So we had to unfreeze it by building fires in order to dig and put down the railroad tracks.

To the best of my recollection, this particular system of slave labor camps was very crowded, and from guards and other prisoners I learned it was estimated that at least 4 million prisoners were working on this one railroad line at that particular time.

All these slave laborers were divided into shock brigades, or working brigades, numbering from ten to fifteen thousand members each.

These prisoners were both political and ordinary criminals, but the majority were political prisoners.

Among the political prisoners you could find writers, professors, lawyers, other professional men, and also workers and teachers and common peasants who were accused of being saboteurs and enemies of the Soviet regime.

Many were sent there merely for raising their voices, criticizing this agricultural policy of the Soviet Union, of the government.

Mr. McNAMARA. Was there any difference in the treatment given the political prisoners and the ordinary criminals?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Sadly, there was a marked difference in the treatment of political and criminal prisoners. Ordinary criminals and thieves were given light assignments, I mean, not heavy work, and they were known as not socially dangerous.

The political prisoners were considered dangerous.

Mr. ARENS. When were you released from the slave labor camp?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I might say that I did not finish my term because I escaped from prison.

Mr. ARENS. When?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Political prisoners, even if they complete the term of exile, are usually given a longer term, while ordinary prisoners sometimes have their sentences reduced. I escaped at the end of 1936.

Mr. ARENS. What happened then?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I lived illegally without any passport or documents for over a year in the Soviet Far East, and then I returned—also illegally—to Ukraine.

In 1938 I went illegally to visit my mother in Ukraine, and there I was caught by the Soviet police again.

Mr. ARENS. How did you sustain yourself in the meantime?

Mr. BAHRIANY. It was comparatively easy for me to live illegally in the Far East, because I lived among the people who sympathized with political prisoners and escapees, and I took part in the hunting for wild animals.

As a result of this experience I later wrote a book which was published in English, in America, *The Hunters and the Hunted*. I wrote it after the Second World War.

For some time I lived illegally among the people, who sympathized with my plight, and eventually I purchased falsified documents on which I traveled.

When I escaped I lived in the area between Vladivostok and Khabarovsk. That area is covered with large forests and there are many Ukrainian settlers who were sent there either by the Czar or by the Communists, and among them I hid and hunted wild animals.

Mr. ARENS. Then I understood you to say that in 1938 you were again apprehended. Will you please pick up the theme of your life beginning in 1938?

Mr. BAHRIANY. When I came back to Ukraine in 1938 I was arrested by the NKVD and kept in prison. I was put in the NKVD prison in Kharkov where I spent 2 years and 7 months under investigation.

I was accused again of anti-Soviet activities and my literary activities were construed as anti-Soviet, and also I was accused of high treason because I had tried to cross into Manchuria, which was then under Japanese occupation. I was also accused of fomenting armed uprisings against the Soviet Union.

Mr. ARENS. Then what happened?

Mr. BAHRIANY. During the period of my detention in Kharkov I was tortured physically. I was not given enough to eat; I was put under a special light, and under cold water.

I was confronted by informers who falsely testified and swore they were part of my organization; yet most of these people I had never seen in my life.

Mr. McNAMARA. Was this charge of fomenting armed rebellion against the Soviet Union a true or false charge?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I was opposing communism as a writer, but I never organized any uprising against the Soviet Union. So the charges were false.

Mr. McNAMARA. You said a moment ago you were tortured. Could you describe that a little further?

Mr. BAHRIANY. One form of torture was that of putting the prisoner on the corner of a small stool. You could only sit with part of your body and after 15, 20 minutes, the body becomes paralyzed. I was brought many times to sit on a stool like this with a very small portion, a couple of inches of my body. Sometimes those tortures lasted all night. Sometimes I fainted 10 times and water was thrown on me to bring me back to consciousness.

Or there would be a beating with a wooden ruler here on the shoulder, very slowly, for 1 or 2 hours. This method of hitting the prisoner on the shoulder with a wooden ruler was known as the "epaulet system" because the beating caused the shoulders of the prisoners to swell, giving the effect of a military insignia, an epaulet. It is very painful, you know, because you are beaten on the shoulder when it is swollen. The prisoner faints; he cannot sustain that.

The purpose of these tortures was to break me down to the point where I would sign a confession and acknowledge all these crimes of which I was accused. But I would not confess.

Mr. ARENS. Then kindly tell us the next occurrence of significance in your life.

Mr. BAHRIANY. Eventually I was put in a death cell where I spent 83 days. I was together with 13 other men condemned to death.

But, at the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party, Stalin tried to make himself popular with the masses again and he turned to relaxation of police control.

Mr. McNAMARA. What year was this?

Mr. BAHRIANY. It was 1939. Stalin himself said that the "enemies of the people" had penetrated the NKVD system and as a result many innocent Communists and non-Communists were perishing. That is what Khrushchev is saying now, the same thing.

A new course took place. For instance, for the time being they stopped executions and even those who were not executed were turned over to the ordinary cells, and so I also was thrown into the ordinary cells.

Mr. ARENS. How long were you held in these cells?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I was kept for another 6 months in prison and I again went through an investigation, but without torture or maltreatment.

They could not prove anything and I was released, but I was placed under the surveillance of the secret police in my native town.

Mr. ARENS. Then what happened?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I could not move from my native village and had to live under police surveillance until the outbreak of the German-Soviet war.

Mr. ARENS. Why do the Soviets persecute poets, writers or other literary persons more than they do criminals?

Mr. BAHRIANY. The Soviet regime considers that ordinary criminals, when they commit a crime, damage or do harm to, a single person or an individual, whereas poets, writers, literary figures, when they are anti-Soviet, naturally damage the entire Soviet system, the foundation on which it stands, because through the literature they spread different kinds of ideology, different kinds of beliefs, than those in which the Communists believe.

Criminals or murderers are punished very severely for their crimes when their crimes are directed against Communist Party officials, but not if they are directed against ordinary citizens.

Mr. ARENS. Could you describe in a little more detail the administration or regime and punishment in the Soviet prisons?

Mr. BAHRIANY. The Soviet prison regime was very strict, especially during the era of Yezhov, because at that time Stalin was waging very extensive purges against real and imaginary enemies of the regime. Even the previous Soviet police regime was much more lenient than that I experienced during my arrest by the NKVD.

For instance, I spent 8 months in a cell which was originally destined for one person, with 37 other prisoners.

Another point of my prison life that I could mention is that in the Kharkov prison, where during the Czarist regime there had been kept 25 prisoners, I was placed in a group of 340 prisoners. Naturally, conditions were unbearable from the viewpoint of sanitation and health.

The only food that we received was 600 grams of black bread, a plate of soup, and sometimes a spoon of barley and tea.

We did not have walks prescribed by the prison administration. We should have walked every day, in the fresh air, but as it happened for many weeks at a time we were not released from our cells.

Sometimes even that meager portion of food could not be consumed because most of the prisoners were tortured and beaten. They were unable to eat when they returned to their cells from the investigation and questioning.

Mr. ARENS. Could you, Mr. Bahriany, give us an idea of the death rates in the slave labor camps at the time you were an inmate?

Mr. BAHRIANY. The death rate among slave labor prisoners is extremely high. I recall in one city called Komsomolsk on the Amur River, several thousand prisoners died daily during the severe winter I was there. As I recall, in the city in the neighborhood there were about 400,000 prisoners working there under the supervision of police guards.

They had no housing facilities. They used to live in "hutments" or dugouts that they had to construct themselves. They had no sanitation facilities. They had no health inspection and food. Sometimes they had to provide for themselves by foraging.

Many prisoners who tried to escape could not go very far because the closest city from this prison camp was 400 kilometers away. If prisoners were not caught by guards and police dogs, they died of starvation or the extreme cold.

Mr. ARENS. When you escaped the first time, how far did you have to travel from the camp before you reached a haven of some kind? How did you travel, on foot?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I had to travel 90 kilometers through the *taiga*. That is the vegetation inside Siberia. I had to travel 90 kilometers before I could find some settlers who helped me.

I was lucky, because at the time I escaped, there was no passport required as yet of individual Soviet citizens. That was introduced after I came to the city of Khabarovsk.

Mr. ARENS. Were you pursued from the camp when you made your escape?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I was not individually pursued because it was very hard to keep a tight control. There were so many prisoners and sometimes they escaped in large groups. Since it is very hard to reach the European countries from Siberia, it is very doubtful whether many prisoners could actually reach safety. Many of them died, some of them were recaptured by police dogs.

What I could add is that, at that time, it was relatively easy to hide from the police in those areas whose settlers were sympathetic to the political prisoners.

Mr. ARENS. When the German-Soviet war broke out, what happened to you then?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I remained in Ukraine when the Germans came because I could not retreat with the Soviet troops and did not want to. During the German occupation of Ukraine, I was working in the Ukrainian theater which the Germans had allowed to exist.

When the Germans were retreating I went with hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians to the west, first to Western Ukraine, then through Austria, Yugoslavia, to West Germany.

Mr. ARENS. Was this a refugee column you traveled with?

Mr. BAHRIANY. From Ukraine I traveled with groups of thousands of Ukrainian refugees who were running westward, but in 1944 I joined the Ukrainian anti-Soviet and anti-German partisan organization known as the UPA (the Ukrainian Insurgent Army).

Mr. ARENS. And fought with it?

Mr. BAHRIANY. And I fought with them against both. In the ranks of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army I fought against both the Nazis and Bolsheviks.

Mr. ARENS. Where were you when World War II ended?

Mr. BAHRIANY. When the Second World War came to an end I was in the northeastern part of Yugoslavia known as Carinthia. I was in a group of Ukrainian partisans who had succeeded in reaching Yugoslavia, and then we tried to cross the Austrian border to join the Ukrainian division which had been organized by the Germans to fight against the Soviet troops.

During that time the Germans surrendered, and I eventually found myself in Tyrol. Shortly after I was elected chairman of the Ukrainian Relief Committee in Innsbruck, Austria.

Mr. ARENS. Did the Soviet secret police try to repatriate you and other Ukrainians who had escaped during the war?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Immediately after the end of the last war the Soviet Government tried to persuade the Western Allies to repatriate all Ukrainians, whom they claimed as Soviet citizens, not only those who came from Soviet Ukraine proper, but also those who came from other parts of Ukraine, which were under Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania.

One of my tasks as chairman of this Ukrainian Relief Committee in Innsbruck was to save the Ukrainians from falling into Soviet hands by persuading the Allied Commander not to release them to the Russian zone.

Mr. ARENS. Did you at that time publish a booklet on the subject of repatriation?

Mr. BAHRIANY. When the Soviet police tried to kidnap me or arrest me in Austria, I went to Bavaria and I saw how many people were being repatriated.

Then I decided to do something and I wrote a pamphlet, *Why I Don't Want to Go Home*. It was soon translated in many European languages, including Italian, German, and Spanish.

Mr. ARENS. You successfully avoided repatriation and you have lived in Germany since the end of World War II? Is that right?

Mr. BAHRIANY. That is right. At that time I successfully evaded all lures and Soviet threats, and I have been living in Germany, in the city of Ulm.

Mr. ARENS. Do you still have members of your family, immediate members of your family, and relatives living in Ukraine?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I have a son. My wife died during the war and left a small boy from whom I was separated. My son was 6 years old when I was separated from him. Now he is 23 years old.

Mr. ARENS. Since your escape have the Communists tried to stop your anti-Communist writing and activities?

Mr. BAHRIANY. All the time Communist agents tried to blackmail me or to silence my literary and political activity.

I received many letters from the Soviet officials; some anonymous, in which they promised me full pardon if I returned to Ukraine. Then I was threatened with moral and physical destruction.

When this did not bring any results they began attacking me in the Soviet press and over the radio. I have with me the official organ of

the Union of Writers of Ukraine, The Literary Gazette, in which I am labeled a bourgeois nationalist and an agent of western imperialists.

A scathing attack, written by Rostyslav Bratun on the Free Ukrainian Writers' Congress which took place in New York in December of 1958, appeared in the March 20, 1959, issue of the *Literaturna Hazeta* (The Literary Gazette), official organ of the Union of Writers of Ukraine. The article entitled, "Wailing on the Garbage Dump," referred to me in the following manner:

The wailing of the universal bigwig of the nationalist *graphomania*, Ivan Bahriany, who came especially from Europe to shine with his venerability, is self-eloquent. What spiritual world could have these people, who eliminated themselves from their own society and branded themselves with the heaviest crime—treason—and how could they find "pathways" to human souls? No, gentlemen. You will never find such pathways on the free Ukrainian Soviet soil and you will vainly hope to find any repercussion among us. But abroad, too, these "pathways" are being covered with the thorn of hatred, which you yourself are sowing in the souls of honest Ukrainian emigrés. And Mr. Bahriany is perturbed that "the process (meaning the literary process) in the emigration is apathetic because we have no ground." It is difficult not to agree with this, although further statements of Bahriany about their "ground in Ukraine" can evoke only laughter * * *

About the *graphomania* of Ivan Bahriany we can say hardly anything, although he makes statements that world literature acquired an outstanding manifestation of a new artistry in his person * * *

This is only the last instance of their blackmail, but they had been doing that for many months. Not only that, they even compelled my son to call me on the radio so that I should return to Ukraine.

I mentioned my pamphlet, *Why I Don't Want to Go Home*. Now in the Soviet-published paper in the Ukrainian language in East Berlin, appeared a bitter denunciation of me by an alleged returnee who wrote an article under the title, "Why I Came Back to My Fatherland."

In the December 1958 issue (No. 95), (289) of *Za poverennia na Batrikivshchynu* (For the Return to the Fatherland), the Ukrainian-language organ of the Soviet committee of the same name with headquarters in East Berlin, the Communists attacked me and my literary activity. Communist writer Z. Demchenko, in an article, "Why I Came Back to My Fatherland," wrote about me:

Having scavenged the European emigre garbage dumps where he collected many lies about the USSR, to which he added his own, Ivan Bahriany, leader of the URD—Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party, which is not a party at all, sat down and wrote a book, *Why I Don't Want to Go Home*.

With this "poor" relative for whom Mr. Bahriany is crucifying himself, I was acquainted at a time when he was running about without pants, and, therefore, I know how he hobbled with the landlords and how he tried to be one of them. I know that he was punished by the Soviet Government, not for the fact that he was "poor" and had only 84 hectares of land, but because he, together with Mr. Tuharynov, son of a general, and Ivan Kulyk, son of the priest from Hrusk, forced peasants of Kuzmin into a lake and flogged them with knouts in the name of the government of Hetman Skoropadsky.

The rest of what he wrote is sheer lies. This "work" Mr. Bahriany wrote with his own interests in mind. He understood the situation well, he knew well what the world hyenas wanted in order to fabricate lies about our Fatherland, for which they paid abundantly. Mr. Bahriany made no mistake; his lies were to the tastes of highly placed persons. Thus for the "courage" to lie shamelessly they gave him a medal and made a martyr out of him.

World hyenas, who always sharpen the sabers against our Fatherland, gladly accepted the lies of Bahriany. Having taken this into account, the Russian emigrés wrote for Mr. Guzenko even a longer lie, featuring cynical and vulgar attacks upon soldiers and officers of the Red Army; subsequently, the staff of

Kerensky prepared a still longer book of lies for Mr. Kravchenko; and the lies of Bahriany became stale. Bahriany meditated but could not come up with new lies, and unlike Guzenko and Kravchenko, he failed to receive from American "private circles" a home somewhere in America and money * * *.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Bahriany, in your earlier years as a writer in Ukraine, you collaborated with various literary persons there in writers' groups and journals. Were all of these men Communist Party members?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I collaborated with many prominent Ukrainian Soviet writers during my early literary activities. None of them, or very few of them, was a member of the Communist Party. Even such great Ukrainian writers who are now members of the Soviet Ukrainian government, such as Maxim Rylsky, Pavlo Tychyna, or Mykola Bazhan, were not members.

As far as I can recollect, only Korneichuk was a member of the *Komsomol* youth organization.

Indeed, many of these prominent Ukrainian writers became Communists only after the mass destruction of Ukrainian intelligentsia by the Stalin regime.

Mr. ARENS. Was this the reign of Yezhov terror?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Yes. Then, as far as I know, poets like Bazhan, Tychyna, and Rylsky became members of the Communist Party in 1938.

It is my understanding they did so in order to save their own lives, and naturally once they joined the Communist Party they became official poets and exponents of the Soviet regime and so they have managed to survive up to this day.

Another prominent Ukrainian poet, Volodymyr Sosiura, was a member of the Communist Party but he always had conflicts with the party because of his individualistic and nationalist attitude.

Also, he was having conflicts with the Communist Party and police because in 1917 he was a soldier in the Ukrainian National Army under Petlura. He joined the Communist Party only after the defeat of the Ukrainian National Government and therefore he was always accused by the party of not being a true Communist, of being a turncoat.

Mr. ARENS. Could you describe for us, Mr. Bahriany, some of the things that the Soviet Union did to the intellectuals in Ukraine during the days of the Yezhov terror.

Mr. BAHRIANY. One of the greatest crimes the Soviet regime committed against the Ukrainian people was the wholesale destruction of Ukrainian poets, writers, professors, and other professional men who had anything to do with the Ukrainian literary life.

Prior to my arrest in 1932, I knew of some two hundred fifty outstanding Ukrainian intellectuals, poets, writers, professors. In 1938 only thirty-three of them had survived. The rest of them had been arrested, tried, deported or executed.

Many of them also could not bear the mental and moral persecution and committed suicide.

This mass destruction extended also to other strata of the Ukrainian people, for instance, the priests; the Orthodox Ukrainian priests, the teachers, and also young men, and also many who served in the Soviet armed forces.

All were destroyed because they were considered disloyal or dangerous to the Soviet regime in Ukraine.

I might add that during my stay in many Soviet prisons and slave labor camps I met a great number of prisoners, a great percentage of whom were of intellectual level. Of course the overwhelming majority of them were Ukrainians, but they were also from other nationalities.

I described extensively the experiences of these intellectual classes in Soviet prisons in my book, *The Gethsemane Garden*.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. Bahriany, just recently, May 18 to 23, the third All-Union Soviet Writers' Congress was held in the Grand Kremlin Palace. Khrushchev and various ministers and members of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party took part in this gathering.

At the congress itself, Georgi Markov, a Moscow writer, urged the delegates to uphold "Socialist realism" against "bourgeois influences" of all kinds.

Could you tell us what is meant by "Socialist realism" in literature?

Mr. BAHRIANY. The term "Socialist realism" is something that is very hard to define. What the party wants by it is to have Soviet writers write not what is reality but what the party wants it to be. Therefore, what is meant is falsification of reality.

According to the precepts of the Communist Party, "Socialist realism" should also dominate Soviet literature, which means in practice that everything should be subordinated to the policies of the Communist Party, that not a single phase of Soviet life could be free of domination and control of the party, even love.

Love also has a "Socialist realism." Love has to be described in terms of Socialist realism and also should have political purpose.

To give you perhaps a not very scientific but a very common example with which the Soviet writers have to cope: if a novelist writes a novel, the hero, in his relations with the girl that he loves, does not talk about emotions or about their attachment to each other, but they have to talk about what the party has in mind.

For instance, they have to worry about the next Seven-Year Plan or the campaign in Kazakhstan to resettle and to cultivate "virgin lands." (Kazakhstan is a province in Siberia.)

Mr. ARENS. What did Markov have in mind when he urged Soviet writers to guard against "bourgeois influences"?

Mr. BAHRIANY. What Markov had in mind is exactly what Khrushchev said at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party: to fight against capitalist prejudice and bourgeois influence.

What is meant by it is that they were afraid of anything that is not controlled by the party. For instance, they are afraid of Western European influence, whatever form it might take.

Private property: they do not want people to think that because of the concept of private property they should own their own house. It is considered as capitalistic prejudice and naturally a bourgeois influence.

Naturally, under the bourgeois influence and capitalist prejudice they consider everything that we in the West cherish as inherent to us: freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and above all, freedom of country, of their own country, like Ukraine.

The masses of the people still cling to these "capitalistic prejudices." Many people still cherish this, what they call the capitalist prejudices

of private property, love of freedom, and the Bolsheviks try to destroy that by calling these capitalist prejudices, and therefore foreign to the Soviet mentality.

Mr. ARENS: Mr. Markov also said that "partisanship" is "the supreme expression of the bond between art and literature and the people." What does he mean by this?

Mr. BAHRIANY: What Markov means by partisanship as a bond between literature and art and the people is the whole concept of Stalin, and now pursued by Khrushchev, that Soviet writers cannot be detached from the people.

What they mean by the people is the Communist Party. They always identify the Communist Party with the people, so they want authors to write about the Communist Party, but they want them to believe that, in doing so, they are writing about the people.

Mr. ARENS: Partisanship, in other words, means allegiance to the party?

Mr. BAHRIANY: Yes, indeed. Furthermore, the partisanship of the people means when the Soviet writers write in the name of, allegedly in the name of the people, they praise whatever the Soviet regime has achieved.

But actually, if you would be a true friend of the people you would have to castigate the Soviet Government because it robs the common people of everything they have. They have no private property; they have no liberty. They are not free.

Actually, the Communists talk in the name of the people. They create many things in the name of the people, but actually people have nothing to do or say about it. They create a fiction, "fictitious realism," which does not exist.

Mr. McNAMARA: Mr. Bahriany, I am going to read a quotation to you and then ask you if, on the basis of your experience as a writer in the Communist-controlled Ukraine, this quotation sounds familiar to you:

The lofty duty of Soviet writers is to reveal truthfully and vividly the splendour of people's achievements in production, the majesty and grandeur of the fight for Communism; to be passionate propagandists for the Seven-Year Plan; to instill courage and energy into the hearts of the Soviet people; to root out the survivals of capitalism in people's minds; to help do away with all that holds up our progress. This is the path along which the great art of Communism will develop—an art * * * capable of inspiring millions and millions of builders of Communism to new great achievements.

This quotation is taken from the greeting sent to the recent Soviet Writers' Congress by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Have you heard anything like it before?

Mr. BAHRIANY: This quotation from the greetings sent to the recent Soviet Writers' Congress by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is by all means not new.

As a writer, I heard many, many years ago the same slogan, the same motto, which you have just read.

As a matter of fact, it dates back to Stalin when he initiated the Five-Year Plans.

This quotation would also be a very adequate answer to what is "Socialist realism."

Mr. ARENS: In other words, that is a very good definition of what they mean by "Socialist realism"?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Exactly. This would be an appropriate definition of "Socialist realism."

This further concerns what I said, that whatever a writer has to say he has to support the Communist Party, even if this is not true. You have to praise the party, that it has made great achievements.

There is in the Communist system no great achievement. There is no heroism and there is no aspiration on the part of the people to build communism. The general life of the people is quite miserable, and yet the party says that they all are "inspired," millions are inspired, to build up the Communist Party.

That is exactly what could be defined as "Socialist realism."

I personally suffered persecution because I could not recognize this dictum of the Communist Party and naturally opposed it, and for this I was arrested and exiled.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Bahriany, does this concept of "Socialist realism" apply to other arts as well as to writing; that is, to painting, sculpture, the theater, poetry, and so forth?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Indeed, it applies to every known art, not only writing, but also the motion picture industry, fine painting, sculpture, and all.

Mr. ARENS. And music?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Music, particularly music.

The Soviet Government considers that art should not be left for art's sake. Every art should be subordinate to political objectives. Therefore, they are very much against modern paintings and they are against modern musicians. Many composers suffered persecution because their music was not in conformity with the objectives of the party.

If an artist or painter writes or paints or composes music individually and not according to the party, he is considered a dangerous enemy of the party.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Bahriany, I should like to ask your opinion of a significant development at the recent writers' conference. Khrushchev made a two-hour speech at this congress, and much of his speech comprised an appeal for tolerance, understanding, and the rehabilitation and re-education of erring Soviet writers.

He said: "We believe that there are no people who cannot be reformed" and that a real effort should be made to re-educate "to the correct principled positions" writers who had strayed from the fold.

Now, all the major writers who have been outcast recently, with the exception of Boris Pasternak, were rehabilitated at this congress. These included Ilya Ehrenburg, Konstantine Simonov, and the poetess Margarita Aliger, who had been denounced by Khrushchev in 1957 for deviating from Socialist realism.

What do you believe was behind this rehabilitation move?

Mr. BAHRIANY. The rehabilitation move by the Soviet Government today has two phases. They have rehabilitated the present living writers and those who have been executed.

Now let me dwell a little on the policy of "re-education" of the writers. In my opinion, it is the same re-educational policy as practiced by Stalin because, in the final analysis, re-education means the compelling of Soviet writers to follow the policy of the Communist Party.

If writers resent and will not accept this re-education, they are punished, maybe not by exile, but they are punished anyhow, and this, too, could be called re-education.

First, they try to destroy the writers morally by depriving them of the bases of work. They are castigated and, when they are broken morally, then comes physical destruction.

But actually, in this rehabilitation move the Communist Party does not rehabilitate writers but actually it rehabilitates itself. The party tries to absolve itself of accusations of using brutal methods in suppressing literary movements. Therefore, the party tries to emerge as a liberal party and such as could be accepted by the people.

That this process of rehabilitation is deceitful could be best demonstrated by the case of Boris Pasternak. To my way of thinking, Boris Pasternak is the only Soviet writer today who stands in opposition to the regime because no other Soviet writer, including Dudintsev, has done so much harm to the Soviet prestige and the Soviet Government as did Boris Pasternak.

For instance, Dudintsev, like other writers, is fighting for a better communism, while Pasternak is fighting against communism. This is the essential difference.

Actually, the history of Pasternak demonstrates most manifestly that there is no rehabilitation, true rehabilitation. In fact, what Khrushchev is trying to do now is to elevate a new class of Soviet writers who would follow his line unquestioningly.

The other phase of rehabilitation, rehabilitation of those writers who have been executed by the Soviet regime, is a process which has a very interesting characteristic. In Ukraine there were rehabilitated many writers, followers of Mykola Khvylovy who is called a Ukrainian Milovan Djilas.

Many of his followers who were executed have now been posthumously rehabilitated.

Mykola Khvylovy was a leader of anti-Kremlin conception in Ukrainian literature and also in political thinking. He advocated the orientation of Ukrainian writers toward Western European literature. That includes the English, French, German, American, Italian; and he also had anti-Communist conceptions.

Stalin ordered the liquidation of all followers of Khvylovy, which included hundreds of writers, professors, journalists, dramatists, and others.

Among those liquidated was Mykola Kulisher; also Les Kurbas, very outstanding stage producer and theatrical director; another writer, Epik, and many others who were liquidated because they followed Khvylovy in his political and literary thinking.

Now all these Ukrainian writers are being rehabilitated. The question is why?

Because the young generation of Ukrainians, even the members of the *Komsomol* (Communist Youth) organization, is very much interested and poses questions as to why so many prominent writers were killed and exterminated. Naturally, they have sympathy and sentiment for those people who have been liquidated for literary work.

In order to justify this, the Soviet Government says: "These people who have been executed were executed erroneously"; and actually they publish their works, but prepared and edited to suit the purposes of the Communist Party.

Khrushchev says:

They were not actually guilty; they were not against us. In fact, they were misrepresented, and hence they must be rehabilitated.

Mr. ARENS. Did I understand you to say, Mr. Bahriany, that these people's works have been re-edited, with deviations from Communist doctrine eliminated?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Naturally. Most of these works have been re-edited but falsified to show them in such a light as desired by the Soviet Government. I might give examples of how they rehabilitated works of poets or writers who have been liquidated.

There was a novel called, *Black Lake*, by Volodymyr Hzhyskyi. This novel was anti-imperialistic, but the actual bad man in the novel is a Russian who left a child by a young Mongolian girl; and this author was punished because he represented a Russian as a bad man.

Now this novel is re-edited, but all these places were deleted and actually it is prepared in such a way that this man who fathered a child of the girl is a great "benefactor" because he is building a factory for the Mongolian people in Altai.

Mr. ARENS. Why did Moscow compel Pasternak to reject the Nobel prize for literature awarded him for his book, *Dr. Zhivago*, when it permitted Soviet physicists to accept Nobel prizes for scientific achievements?

Mr. BAHRIANY. In my opinion, the acceptance of the Nobel prize by the Soviet scientists brings great prestige and popularity to the Soviet Government as sponsor and protector of science and technology. Naturally, the Soviet Government, the Bolsheviks, accept this Nobel prize with great pride.

They could not accept the Nobel prize for Boris Pasternak for his novel, *Dr. Zhivago*, because this novel is in essence anti-Communist and counterrevolutionary; and in fact, the acceptance of this would by itself condemn the Soviet regime.

Naturally, the granting of the Nobel prize to Boris Pasternak for *Dr. Zhivago* would be a great indictment of the Soviet Government and the Bolshevik regime as a whole.

In my opinion, the work by Pasternak dealt a terrific blow to Soviet power and prestige, perhaps even more than any diplomatic or any international act by the Western democracies, in the eyes of the enslaved peoples of the U.S.S.R.

Therefore, the Bolsheviks and the Soviet Government could not accept the Nobel prize for Pasternak and Pasternak is *persona non grata* in Soviet literary circles.

Mr. ARENS. What significance do you attach to the fact that Pasternak was not rehabilitated at the recent congress of Soviet writers?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Because Pasternak, in the eyes of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party, is an anti-Communist and anti-regime and therefore is considered as being the "enemy" of the Soviet system. Therefore they could never rehabilitate him.

Mr. ARENS. Do you consider that it was an indirect way by which Khrushchev told all Soviet writers that they have to toe the line or else? Was it a form of warning to them?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Pasternak refused to debase himself, to humiliate himself, and could never apologize to Khrushchev. Therefore, Khrushchev would never pardon him.

Indirectly, it is a warning to all the writers not to follow in Pasternak's footsteps. It is also one of the new methods of re-education, and the most effective method of re-education, at that started by Khrushchev.

Mr. ARENS. Did Stalin's death and the alleged end of Stalinism in the Soviet Union have any real significance for writers in the Soviet Union? Does it mean they will have any more freedom?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Actually the death of Stalin, to my way of thinking, did not in essence bring any actual change as far as the atmosphere for the Soviet writers is concerned. I never knew of, and I read Soviet publications, any outstanding Soviet writer of mark, to criticize Stalin.

It is regrettable that the West has a very erroneous interpretation of Khrushchev's opposition, or rather of Khrushchev's degradation of Stalin.

Khrushchev never condemned Stalin for destroying about six million Ukrainian peasants who refused to accept voluntary collectivization. Khrushchev also failed to condemn Stalin for his wholesale liquidation of the opposition of Trotskyites and also of the so-called bourgeois nationalists in Ukraine and other national republics of the U.S.S.R.

Mr. ARENS. Is it true, Mr. Bahriany, that after enumerating all these crimes which Stalin had committed, Khrushchev turned around and praised him as a good Communist?

Mr. BAHRIANY. He not only praised but he called him a "genius Communist," which means a great Communist leader, who succeeded in preserving the Soviet state by destroying all opposition.

As a matter of fact, the present-day policy of Khrushchev is a replica of the policies of Stalin. It is still a policy of cruel dictatorship by the Communist Party.

I know on good authority that, at the present time, terror exists in the Soviet Union. There are many forms of this terror. Moral terror is expressed in the struggle against so-called "revisionism," but there is also physical terror in the Soviet Union.

Naturally, they manage all this with kid gloves, and the Western world hardly knows about it, but the terror continues to exist.

As one example, in the city of Kharkov, there was a beautiful building in the center of the city which was a central prison of the secret police; yet for many years people did not know it was a secret police building although the prison was filled with political prisoners.

The same even now: many terrorist acts are being committed, and yet the West regrettably believes that Khrushchev has abandoned the methods employed by Stalin.

I could mention that five Ukrainian refugees were allegedly dropped by American planes in Kiev in 1953. Among them was Okhrymowych. They were executed. And only in May of this year another five Ukrainian nationalists were executed for alleged anti-Soviet crimes in Ukraine.

Another phase of terror is so-called "voluntary resettlement" of many Ukrainians in Kazakhstan, which is being implemented by Khrushchev now.

Mr. ARENS. Do Communists use children to blackmail their parents who are writers?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Indeed they do. I could cite my own example because the Soviet Government is using my own son in order to

threaten and blackmail me so that I would either return to Ukraine or stop my literary and political activities in Europe. My son's name is Boris Ivanovych Bahriany.

The Soviet-sponsored Committee for the Return to the Fatherland, with headquarters in East Berlin, has been blackmailing me for the past many years because I am editing a paper called, "We Will Return Again," meaning we will return to a free Ukraine—that we will return to Ukraine as free citizens upon destruction of the Soviet system.

So as I mentioned before, they resorted to blackmail and are using my son to induce me to return.

First, my son pleaded with me over the Soviet-controlled radio, that I should return. When that did not materialize, my son began calling me names, that I am a "traitor" to my country and that I sold out to Western imperialism.

Mr. ARENS. Do you know for sure that it was your son who was doing this?

Mr. BAHRIANY. Of course I am not definitely sure but I have all indications and I feel it was my son.

I also saw his picture. It was printed in the paper called "For the Return to the Fatherland," published in East Berlin by the said Committee for the Return to the Fatherland.

My son's pictures present him as a Soviet soldier in the city of Lutsk in Ukraine. I am convinced that my son was before the microphone.

Mr. ARENS. As a man with wide experience in both the literary and cultural field and with communism, could you tell us what in your opinion is behind the current Soviet promotion of so-called "cultural exchanges"?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I think that the so-called cultural exchanges and exhibits have many dangerous features which Western nations, including the United States, do not realize.

One of the most important purposes of these exchanges is to demoralize the Western countries, including the United States of America. It would be interesting for many Americans to know that these Soviet exchanges and exhibits portray, here in America and in many other countries, things which do not exist in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet authorities endeavor to convince the world that they have such attainments in the arts, in ballet, in music, and in other branches of culture because there exists cultural freedom in the U.S.S.R.

In reality there is none such because there is no cultural freedom at all.

Therefore, by showing these cultural attainments, the so-called attainments, they try to hide what they do not have. They do not have freedom of literature. They have freedom of artistic creativeness, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and freedom of thought.

They also hide the absence of literary freedom. As I have explained, there are no free writers who can write what they want. Actually they conceal with these exhibits here, the so-called Socialist realism, which we discussed before, and the dictatorship of the Communist Party.

Furthermore, this cultural exchange covers up the actual suppression of the national cultures of many peoples in the Soviet Union. Why at this time, when they show attainments of the Soviet state

in the literary and artistic fields, at this very moment, they are suppressing the culture of the Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, and Byelorussians—and the Baltic peoples, who have no freedom to develop their own culture.

They hide the Russification program which is even more dangerous for the free world, inasmuch as Moscow is perpetrating a vast spiritual genocide against the many peoples it controls.

The present policy of Moscow leads or led to the fact that the national languages, as in Ukraine, where the majority of people speak that language, or in Georgia, the native languages are given a secondary place.

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. voted a law which provides that in Ukraine the Russian language should be the dominant language and as for the Ukrainian language, they left it up to students themselves to decide whether they want to study Ukrainian or Russian.

This is an official organ called *Radyausua Ukraine (Soviet Ukraine)*; and this is a decree which I just discussed, which provides for the Russian language to be dominant in non-Russian republics like Ukraine, Georgia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and others.

Oppression and persecution of the people who live in the Soviet Union are covered over by the cultural exchange which we have now, because many people here think that because the U.S.S.R. has a beautiful ballet and dancers that in the Soviet Union is a free development of culture and arts, which is not the case.

In my opinion this cultural exchange is very detrimental, dangerous, for the United States because it demoralizes the American people and will enhance the spread of Communist tendencies and actually covers up the brutal reality which exists in the Soviet Union behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. ARENS. Mr. Bahriany, the United States has just shipped to the Soviet Union a collection of paintings and works of sculpture to be exhibited in Moscow this summer. One of the artists who is represented in this exhibition is an identified Communist Party member here. Several others have extensive records of affiliation with Communist fronts and, because of public support of the policies of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union, have been acclaimed in the Communist press of this country as "people's artists" and as "painters of social satire."

Do you believe that sending the painting of such people is a sound propaganda device and that it will assist the United States?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I think that sending these paintings by these pro-Communist or Communist sculptors and painters to the Soviet Union is a great disservice to the American people and to the cause of peace. There exists a great difference in mentality between the American people and the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Could you imagine the Soviet Union sending to America, as its own exhibits, works by people who are opposed to Moscow, say for instance, Boris Pasternak?

To American mentality that is normal, but the Bolsheviks could never accept as representative of art and literature, people or their works that represent the opposition to the regime, because that would give the impression that the entire elite of the Soviet Union is against the Communist Party and against the dictatorship and would create

the impression here in the West that all great artists in the Soviet Union are opposed to communism.

Naturally it would nurture in turn sentiments in support of anti-Communist movements.

They have in this thinking a certain logic and also certain reasons. And the United States sending to the Soviet Union as exhibits, works created by, say, Communist artists—what would the Soviet population have to think about that? The conclusion that it would of necessity have to draw is that the Communist Party, the Communist elite and intellectuals in the United States, are very strong because their exhibits are being sent to Moscow.

The Soviet Government will certainly exploit to the fullest extent the very fact that the United States Government is sending exhibits by pro-Communist artists. They will say: "You see, even the greatest capitalist country, America, has no one but Communist artists."

This, I think, is not only greatly detrimental to American prestige, but also criminal because after the Hungarian uprising, after the upheavals in Poland and after Tibet, now what we see is the United States trying to support the prestige, the false prestige, of the Communist system in the U.S.S.R.

When we send exhibits of social satire or cartoons, this damages American prestige very strongly in the Soviet Union.

The Communist officials and elite writers will say, "Well, you might not believe us when we say everything is better in the U.S.S.R. than in America, but now you have American artists who satirize the American way of life."

To have the freedom of criticizing American art and science here in America is perfectly all right; but for the United States Government to criticize American life through American artists in the Soviet Union is a crime. The Russians will interpret that entirely differently than we would interpret it.

Mr. ARENS. Do you believe anything like "peaceful coexistence" is possible between the Soviet Union and the free world?

Mr. BAHRIANY. I personally do not believe in such a possibility. Although it might exist, in the final analysis it will be the Communist bloc but not the free world which will benefit by "coexistence," because communism is an aggressive movement.

Whether in war or in peace it always attacks and progresses. Khrushchev himself stated on many occasions that "We will overcome you. We will defeat you through peaceful, competitive coexistence"; but how peaceful coexistence looks according to the Soviet mentality is something different, because the overall purpose of the Communist Party is the destruction of the free world.

It might not proceed by direct frontal attacks, but go through the back door to demoralize and take one country after another, as Khrushchev has been doing so far, without war, because constitutional provisions in the free world facilitate operation of Communist agents.

In an official declaration signed by all Communist leaders like Gomulka at a Communist conference attended by all Communist leaders which was held in Moscow, Khrushchev clearly indicated that their aspiration is to overtake the free world by organizing Communist parties in the free world and by associating with other Socialist parties, and by capitalizing upon advantages which exist in free countries, such as trade unions and political parties.

He clearly indicated that the Communists will seize the power by peaceful means, even by democratic processes, by infiltration and taking over by organization and the voting of Communists into power.

Another method is to use economic dumping of food, of surplus goods, in countries which are in need of it; or through cultural expansion, the cultural exchange being one of the main facets of this cultural expansion by the Soviet Union.

Therefore, I am convinced that there is no possibility of peaceful coexistence but, if we do exist, in the final analysis it will be Moscow and not the free world which eventually will win.

I am convinced that this peaceful coexistence will not bring about what the West collectively desires because time is on the side of Moscow and time eventually will help them to overcome us.

Mr. ARENS. Do you believe that at the present time the Soviet Union or the West is winning the cold war?

Mr. BARRIANY. In my opinion the cold war is being won by the West, and the Soviet Union is losing it. Therefore, the Bolsheviks protest against the cold war. They want to terminate it because it is not going in their favor.

One of the proofs that the Russians, the Bolsheviks, are afraid of the cold war is that they are jamming the propaganda media of the free world which is sending information to Communist countries.

Mr. ARENS. On the basis of your experience, would you give us an estimate of the U.S. psychological offense against communism?

Mr. BARRIANY. I should like to be very frank, even if my remarks may not please someone. I think that the American statesmen and men who are in charge of American psychological warfare do not take as yet full advantage of these possibilities as the Russians take on their side.

They do not take advantage of the most contradictory situation of the Soviet Union, namely, the struggle of the enslaved nations against the present regime.

On the other hand, we see that the Bolsheviks are exploiting the struggle of the common people in the Middle East and in Asia for their own advantage; but the West does not take similar advantage as provided by the situation in the Soviet Union.

What I think the West should do is to talk to the peoples of the Soviet Union in the language that they understand. That does not mean only talk their language but also to talk in the language of their social and national interest; talk to their hearts.

I want to say that I think it was a great mistake on the part of the Voice of America to curtail the broadcasts over the Voice of America to Ukraine in the Ukrainian language, because the Ukrainian people are the second largest people in the Soviet Union after the Russian people.

They number about forty-five million, and the Ukrainian problem in the Soviet Union is one of the greatest contradictions in the Soviet Union.

I do think that a third world war could be avoided by a series of revolutions in the Soviet Union, on the same pattern as we had in Hungary. Therefore, the curtailment of the Ukrainian language broadcasts over the Voice of America is, in my opinion, detrimental to the interests of America itself because it undermines the confidence and friendship and love of the Ukrainian people for the United States.

I heard this argument: they curtailed the Ukrainian language broadcast because everybody understands the Russian language in Ukraine. As one who was reared and lived in Ukraine I could say that not all Ukrainians understand Russian.

Secondly, even if they understand, they certainly do not like the Russian language.

Thirdly, if you want to gain the sympathies of the Ukrainian people you have to prove that you also are their friend.

This is my conclusive opinion about the possibilities that the United States has in exploiting contradictions existing in the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bahriany, on behalf of the committee I should like to thank you for appearing before us in this consultation. You have added considerably to our knowledge, particularly of cultural life in the Soviet Union and we are most thankful and appreciative of this.

(Whereupon, at 5:10 p.m., Wednesday, June 3, 1959, the consultation was concluded.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Aliger, Margarita.....	16
Bahriany, Boris Ivanovych.....	20
Bahriany, Ivan P.....	1, 2, 3-24 (statement)
Bazhan, Mykola.....	13
Bratun, Rostyslav.....	12
Danylo.....	6
Demchenko, Z.....	12
Djilas, Milovan.....	17
Dudintsev (Vladimir).....	17
Dushnyek, Walter.....	3
Ehrenburg, Ilya.....	16
Epik (Hryhorii).....	17
Gomulka (Wladyslaw).....	22
Guzenko (Igor).....	12, 13
Harmash.....	6
Hzhytskyi, Volodymyr.....	18
Kerensky (Alexander).....	13
Khrushchev (Nikita).....	14-19, 22
Khvylovy, Mykola.....	17
Korneichuk (Alexander).....	13
Kravchenko (Victor).....	13
Kulisher, Mykola.....	17
Kulyk, Ivan.....	12
Kurbas, Les.....	17
Markov, Georgi.....	14, 15
Okhrymovych.....	19
Pasternak, Boris.....	16, 17, 18, 21
Petlura (Simon).....	13
Pravdiuk, Ol.....	5
Rylsky, Maxim (Maksym Rylskyi).....	13
Simonov, Konstantine.....	16
Skoropadsky, Hetman.....	12
Sosiura, Volodymyr.....	13
Stalin (Joseph).....	9, 15-17, 19
Tuharynov.....	12
Tychyna, Pavlo.....	13
Yezhov (Nicholas).....	9, 13

ORGANIZATIONS

All-Union Soviet Writers Congress (Third; May 18-23, 1959).....	14-16
Committee for the Return to the Fatherland.....	20
American National Exhibition, July 25, 1959; Moscow.....	2
Communist Party, Soviet Union:	
Central Committee.....	15
Eighteenth Congress, 1939.....	9
Twentieth Congress, February 1956.....	14
Congress of Free Ukrainian Writers. (See Free Ukrainian Writers' Congress.)	
Congress of Ukrainian Soviet Writers.....	4
Free Ukrainian Writers' Congress, December 6, 7, 1958, New York City.....	4, 12
Komsomol (Young Communist League, Soviet Union).....	13, 17
MARS (Workshop of the Revolutionary Word).....	5
Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA).....	10

	Page
Ukrainian National Rada.....	4
Ukrainian Relief Committee (Innsbruck, Austria).....	11
Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party (URD).....	12
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Government of:	
Secret Police, NKVD.....	11
Supreme Soviet.....	21
Union of Writers of Ukraine.....	12
Voice of America.....	23

PUBLICATIONS

Ave Maria.....	5, 6
Black Lake (book).....	18
For the Return to the Fatherland.....	12, 20
Hunters and the Hunted, The (book).....	7
Krytyka (magazine).....	5
Literaturna Hazeta (The Literary Gazette).....	12
Radyausua Ukraine (Soviet Ukraine).....	21
To the Forbidden Frontiers.....	5
Why I Don't Want To Go Home (pamphlet).....	11, 12
Zhivago, Dr.....	18

